

1 Richard Aguila Taguinod, Esq. SBN 203288  
2 Eloisa Songco Quiambao, Esq. SBN 343608  
3 5170 Golden Foothill Parkway, El Dorado Hills, California 95762  
4 Telephone: (916) 618-4388  
5 Fax: (916) 619-4389  
6 Email: rtaguinod@aol.com  
7 Attorneys for the Plaintiffs Russell Gene Thompson and Victoria Thompson

8  
9  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 ESTATE OF RUSSELL GENE THOMPSON,  
13 VICTORIA THOMPSON

14 Plaintiffs,  
15 vs.

16 VETERANS AFFAIRS-SAN FRANCISCO  
17 MEDICAL CENTER, JIA F. LI AS ACTING  
DIRECTOR VA-SAN FRANCISCO  
HEALTHCARE, GEOFFREY STETSON,  
LYNN FLINT, MARCO GOMEZ, JUDITH  
WOLF, DOES 1-100

18 Defendants

19 Case No.: Number

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
**COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF  
INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL  
HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING  
OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING  
MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF,  
VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF,  
VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE  
ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND  
WRONGFUL DEATH**

27 Plaintiff, the late RUSSELL GENE THOMPSON (“RGT”), by and as his surviving  
28 spouse and personal representative, VICTORIA THOMPSON (“VT”), and VICTORIA  
THOMPSON herself, (collectively “Plaintiffs”), hereby allege and complain against the  
Defendant VETERANS AFFAIRS-SAN FRANCISCO MEDICAL CENTER (“VA-SF”),  
Defendant JIA LI, Defendant HAROLD ORTIZ, Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, Defendant  
MARCO GOMEZ, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, (collectively “Defendants”).

27  
28 COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 1

1                   **I.        INTRODUCTION**

2       1. This action is brought by Plaintiffs for Defendants' lack of informed consent, negligence  
3       associated with the tort of lack of informed consent, murder, negligence associated with  
4       homicide, fraud or deceit, negligence associated with fraud or deceit, detention of corpse or  
5       human remains, negligence associated with detention of corpse or human remains, negligence of  
6       VA-SF staff which resulted to 19 open areas, negligence of VA-SF staff which resulted to more  
7       pain on plaintiff because of the open areas, negligence of VA-SF itself as a healthcare hospital  
8       facility, vicarious liability of VA-SF, elder abuse in violation of CA Elder Abuse Law by VA-SF  
9       staff, elder abuse in violation of CA Elder Abuse Law by VA-SF, survival action, and wrongful  
10      death.

11     2. This action seeks all available remedies at law for all the harms done to the Plaintiffs.

13                   **II.       VENUE**

14     3. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this federal district court, pursuant to the Federal  
15      Tort Claims Act (FTCA), 28 U.S.C. §§1346(b) and 2671-2680. The Plaintiffs are alleging civil  
16      actions on claims against the United States, for money damages, accruing on and after January 1,  
17      1945, for injury or loss of property, or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or  
18      wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of  
19      his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person,  
20      would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission  
21      occurred.

22     4. Procedural requirement of filing an administrative tort claim first with the U.S.  
23      Department of Veterans Affairs was met and Plaintiffs expressly authorized to file suit in federal  
24      district court.

25  
26  
27  
28      COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
      AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
      SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 2

5. Each Defendant in this civil action is an employee of the VA-SF, and each cause of action was committed by each Defendant while acting within the scope of his or her employment, while employed by VA-SF.

6. Each Nominal Defendant in this civil action is a biological child of the late RGT but would rather not participate in this litigation as Plaintiffs. Because of this matter, the three (3) biological children of the late RGT are named Nominal Defendants, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §377.60 which allows for this wrongful death claim to be asserted, and *Watkins v. Nutting*, 17 Cal. 2d 490, 498 which allows the biological children who refuse to participate as Plaintiffs be named as Nominal Defendants.

### **III. PARTIES**

7. Plaintiff deceased RGT, by and through his surviving spouse and personal representative VT, was, and at all times relevant hereto, a natural person residing in the County of Sacramento;

8. Plaintiff VT, spouse of deceased veteran RGT, is a natural person residing in the County of Sacramento;

9. At all relevant times, named Defendants have transacted and continue to transact business at VA-SF;

10. Defendant VETERANS AFFAIRS-SAN FRANCISCO MEDICAL CENTER (“VA-SF”), is an entity servicing health care for veterans, located at 4150 Clement Street, San Francisco, CA 94121;

11. Defendant JIA LI, Acting Director of VA-SF, is a natural person;

12. Defendant HAROLD ORTIZ, Chief of Nursing of VA-SF, is a natural person;

13. Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, was the ATTENDING PHYSICIAN, for the late  
RGT;

14. Defendant LYNN FLINT, was the STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS, for the late  
RGT;

**COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 3**

1       15.   Defendant MARCO GOMEZ, was the NURSE, for the late RGT;  
2       16.   Defendant JUDITH WOLF, was the STAFF IN OFFICE OF THE DECEDENT;  
3       17.   Nominal Defendant KATHERINE THOMPSON, residing at 471 Almond Drive Number  
4       86, Lodi CA 95240;  
5       18.   Nominal Defendant DIRK THOMPSON, residing at 4184 Gemstone Drive, Acampo CA  
6       95220;  
7       19.   Nominal Defendant MICHELLE THOMPSON-COWGILL, residing at 10817 Ivoryton  
8       Way, Mather CA 95655;  
9       20.   and  
10      21.   Defendant DOES 1 THROUGH 100.

11      22.   The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of  
12     Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff,  
13     who therefore sue Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure §474.  
14     Plaintiffs are informed and believed, and based thereon allege, that each of the Defendants  
15     designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred  
16     to herein. Plaintiffs will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names  
17     and capacities of the Defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become  
18     known.

19      23.   At all relevant times, each defendant committed the acts, caused, or directed others to  
20     commit the acts, or permitted others to commit the acts, alleged in this Complaint. Additionally,  
21     some or all of the defendants acted as the agent of the other defendants, and all of the defendants  
22     acted within the scope of their agency if acting as agent of another.

24                                  **IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

25      24.   That Plaintiff Virginia Thompson (“VT”) is the surviving spouse of the late Russell Gene  
26     Thompson and resides in the State of California.

27  
28     COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
   AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
   SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 4

1 25. That the late Russell Gene Thompson (“RGT”) died on October 6, 2021, at Veterans  
2 Affairs-San Francisco Medical Center (“VA-SF”), in San Francisco County, California.  
3

4 26. That at all times herein VA-SF was and still is a viable part of the U.S. Department of  
5 Veterans Affairs, providing primary care and health services to U.S. veterans, and is located at  
6 4150 Clement Street, San Francisco, CA 94121.  
7

8 27. That this action is brought partly as a survival action filed by the estate of the deceased  
9 RGT with the surviving spouse Plaintiff VT as the representative, for all harms suffered by the  
10 deceased before dying.  
11

12 28. That this action is brought partly as a wrongful death action by Plaintiff VT as the  
13 surviving spouse.  
14

15 29. That this action is brought partly for fraud, negligence, violation of CA Health & Safety  
16 Code §7053 by Plaintiff VT.  
17

18 30. That this action is brought pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), 28 U.S.C.  
19 §§1346(b) and 2671-2680.  
20

21 31. That procedural requirements under the aforementioned statute were met.  
22

23 32. That the late RGT was hospitalized in Defendant VA-SF from August 19, 2021 to  
24 October 6, 2021. The late RGT’s primary diagnosis was altered mental status secondary to  
25 medication side effects. This was a month and a half stay in Defendant VA-SF, under Defendant  
JIA LI’s, Acting Director of VA-SF, tutelage.  
26

27 33. That at all times relevant, the Defendant VA-SF employed various medical providers,  
28 nurses, and medical staff, at its hospital, to include but not limited to Defendant JIA LI, Acting  
Director of VA-SF; Defendant HAROLD ORTIZ, Chief of Nursing of VA-SF; Defendant  
GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN, for the late RGT; Defendant LYNN  
FLINT, STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS, for the late RGT; and Defendant MARCO  
GOMEZ, NURSE, for the late RGT. That these employees/servants/agents were acting within  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
5510  
5511  
5512  
5513  
5514  
5515  
5516  
5517  
5518  
5519  
5520  
5521  
5522  
5523  
5524  
5525  
5526  
5527  
5528  
5529  
5530  
5531  
5532  
5533  
5534  
5535  
5536  
5537  
5538  
5539  
55310  
55311  
55312  
55313  
55314  
55315  
55316  
55317  
55318  
55319  
55320  
55321  
55322  
55323  
55324  
55325  
55326  
55327  
55328  
55329  
55330  
55331  
55332  
55333  
55334  
55335  
55336  
55337  
55338  
55339  
55340  
55341  
55342  
55343  
55344  
55345  
55346  
55347  
55348  
55349  
55350  
55351  
55352  
55353  
55354  
55355  
55356  
55357  
55358  
55359  
55360  
55361  
55362  
55363  
55364  
55365  
55366  
55367  
55368  
55369  
55370  
55371  
55372  
55373  
55374  
55375  
55376  
55377  
55378  
55379  
55380  
55381  
55382  
55383  
55384  
55385  
55386  
55387  
55388  
55389  
55390  
55391  
55392  
55393  
55394  
55395  
55396  
55397  
55398  
55399  
553100  
553101  
553102  
553103  
553104  
553105  
553106  
553107  
553108  
553109  
553110  
553111  
553112  
553113  
553114  
553115  
553116  
553117  
553118  
553119  
553120  
553121  
553122  
553123  
553124  
553125  
553126  
553127  
553128  
553129  
553130  
553131  
553132  
553133  
553134  
553135  
553136  
553137  
553138  
553139  
553140  
553141  
553142  
553143  
553144  
553145  
553146  
553147  
553148  
553149  
553150  
553151  
553152  
553153  
553154  
553155  
553156  
553157  
553158  
553159  
553160  
553161  
553162  
553163  
553164  
553165  
553166  
553167  
553168  
553169  
553170  
553171  
553172  
553173  
553174  
553175  
553176  
553177  
553178  
553179  
553180  
553181  
553182  
553183  
553184  
553185  
553186  
553187  
553188  
553189  
553190  
553191  
553192  
553193  
553194  
553195  
553196  
553197  
553198  
553199  
553200  
553201  
553202  
553203  
553204  
553205  
553206  
553207  
553208  
553209  
553210  
553211  
553212  
553213  
553214  
553215  
553216  
553217  
553218  
553219  
553220  
553221  
553222  
553223  
553224  
553225  
553226  
553227  
553228  
553229  
553230  
553231  
553232  
553233  
553234  
553235  
553236  
553237  
553238  
553239  
553240  
553241  
553242  
553243  
553244  
553245  
553246  
553247  
553248  
553249  
553250  
553251  
553252  
553253  
553254  
553255  
553256  
553257  
553258  
553259  
553260  
553261  
553262  
553263  
553264  
553265  
553266  
553267  
553268  
553269  
553270  
553271  
553272  
553273  
553274  
553275  
553276  
553277  
553278  
553279  
553280  
553281  
553282  
553283  
553284  
553285  
553286  
553287  
553288  
553289  
553290  
553291  
553292  
553293  
553294  
553295  
553296  
553297  
553298  
553299  
553300  
553301  
553302  
553303  
553304  
553305  
553306  
553307  
553308  
553309  
553310  
553311  
553312  
553313  
553314  
553315  
553316  
553317  
553318  
553319  
553320  
553321  
553322  
553323  
553324  
553325  
553326  
553327  
553328  
553329  
553330  
553331  
553332  
553333  
553334  
553335  
553336  
553337  
553338  
553339  
553340  
553341  
553342  
553343  
553344  
553345  
553346  
553347  
553348  
553349  
553350  
553351  
553352  
553353  
553354  
553355  
553356  
553357  
553358  
553359  
553360  
553361  
553362  
553363  
553364  
553365  
553366  
553367  
553368  
553369  
553370  
553371  
553372  
553373  
553374  
553375  
553376  
553377  
553378  
553379  
553380  
553381  
553382  
553383  
553384  
553385  
553386  
553387  
553388  
553389  
553390  
553391  
553392  
553393  
553394  
553395  
553396  
553397  
553398  
553399  
553400  
553401  
553402  
553403  
553404  
553405  
553406  
553407  
553408  
553409  
553410  
553411  
553412  
553413  
553414  
553415  
553416  
553417  
553418  
553419  
553420  
553421  
553422  
553423  
553424  
553425  
553426  
553427  
553428  
553429  
553430  
553431  
553432  
553433  
553434  
553435  
553436  
553437  
553438  
553439  
553440  
553441  
553442  
553443  
553444  
553445  
553446  
553447  
553448  
553449  
553450  
553451  
553452  
553453  
553454  
553455  
553456  
553457  
553458  
553459  
553460  
553461  
553462  
553463  
553464  
553465  
553466  
553467  
553468  
553469  
553470  
553471  
553472  
553473  
553474  
553475  
553476  
553477  
553478  
553479  
553480  
553481  
553482  
553483  
553484  
553485  
553486  
553487  
553488  
553489  
553490  
553491  
553492  
553493  
553494  
553495  
553496  
553497  
553498  
553499  
553500  
553501  
553502  
553503  
553504  
553505  
553506  
553507  
553508  
553509  
553510  
553511  
553512  
553513  
553514  
553515  
553516  
553517  
553518  
553519  
553520  
553521  
553522  
553523  
553524  
553525  
553526  
553527  
553528  
553529  
553530  
553531  
553532  
553533  
553534  
553535  
553536  
553537  
553538  
553539  
553540  
553541  
553542  
553543  
553544  
553545  
553546  
553547  
553548  
553549  
553550  
553551  
553552  
553553  
553554  
553555  
553556  
553557  
553558  
553559  
553560  
553561  
553562  
553563  
553564  
553565  
553566  
553567  
553568  
553569  
553570  
553571  
553572  
553573  
553574  
553575  
553576  
553577  
553578  
553579  
553580  
553581  
553582  
553583  
553584  
553585  
553586  
553587  
553588  
553589  
553590  
553591  
553592  
553593  
553594  
553595  
553596  
553597  
553598  
553599  
553600  
553601  
553602  
553603  
553604  
553605  
553606  
553607  
553608  
553609  
553610  
553611  
553612  
553613  
553614  
553615  
553616  
553617  
553618  
553619  
553620  
553621  
553622  
553623  
553624  
553625  
553626  
553627  
553628  
553629  
553630  
553631  
553632  
553633  
553634  
553635  
553636  
553637  
553638  
553639  
553640  
553641  
553642  
553643  
553644  
553645  
553646  
553647  
553648  
553649  
553650  
553651  
553652  
553653  
553654  
553655  
553656  
553657  
553658  
553659  
553660  
553661  
553662  
553663  
553664  
553665  
553666  
553667  
553668  
553669  
553670  
553671  
553672  
553673  
553674  
553675  
553676  
553677  
553678  
553679  
553680  
553681  
553682  
553683  
553684  
553685  
553686  
553687  
553688  
553689  
553690  
553691  
553692  
553693  
553694  
553695  
553696  
553697  
553698  
553699  
553700  
553701  
553702  
553703  
553704  
553705  
553706  
553707  
553708  
553709  
553710  
553711  
553712  
553713  
553714  
553715  
553716  
553717  
553718  
553719  
553720  
553721  
553722  
553723  
553724  
553725  
553726  
553727  
553728  
553729  
553730  
553731  
553732  
553733  
553734  
553735  
553736  
553737  
553738  
553739  
5537340  
5537341  
5537342  
5537343  
5537344  
5537345  
5537346  
5537347  
5537348  
5537349  
5537350  
5537351  
5537352  
5537353  
5537354  
5537355  
5537356  
5537357  
5537358  
5537359  
55373510  
55373511  
55373512  
55373513  
55373514  
55373515  
55373516  
55373517  
55373518  
55373519  
55373520  
55373521  
55373522  
55373523  
55373524  
55373525  
55373526  
55373527  
55373528  
55373529  
55373530  
55373531  
55373532  
55373533  
55373534  
55373535  
55373536  
55373537  
55373538  
55373539  
55373540  
55373541  
55373542  
55373543  
55373544  
55373545  
55373546  
55373547  
55373548  
55373549  
55373550  
55373551  
55373552  
55373553  
55373554  
55373555  
55373556  
55373557  
55373558  
55373559  
55373560  
55373561  
55373562  
55373563  
55373564  
55373565  
55373566  
55373567  
55373568  
55373569  
55373570  
55373571  
55373572  
55373573  
55373574  
55373575  
55373576  
55373577  
55373578  
55373579  
55373580  
55373581  
55373582  
55373583  
55373584  
55373585  
55373586  
55373587  
55373588  
55373589  
55373590  
55373591  
55373592  
55373593  
55373594  
55373595  
55373596  
55373597  
55373598  
55373599  
553735100  
553735101  
553735102  
553735103  
553735104  
553735105  
553735106  
553735107  
553735108  
553735109  
553735110  
553735111  
553735112  
553735113  
553735114  
553735115  
553735116  
553735117  
553735118  
553735119  
553735120  
553735121  
553735122  
553735123  
553735124  
553735125  
553735126  
553735127  
553735128  
553735129  
553735130  
553735131  
553735132  
553735133  
553735134  
553735135  
553735136  
553735137  
553735138  
553735139  
553735140  
553735141  
553735142  
553735143  
553735144  
553735145  
553735146  
553735147  
553735148  
553735149  
553735150  
553735151  
553735152  
553735153  
553735154  
553735155  
553735156  
553735157  
553735158  
553735159  
553735160  
553735161  
553735162  
553735163  
553735164  
553735165  
553735166  
553735167  
553735168  
553735169  
553735170  
553735171  
553735172  
553735173  
553735174  
553735175  
553735176  
55373

1 the scope of their employment with the Defendant VA-SF when they rendered medical care to  
2 the late the late RGT. The aforementioned Defendants had a duty to the late RGT to  
3 use such skill, prudence, and diligence as other members of the profession commonly possess  
4 and exercise; that aforementioned Defendants breached that duty which caused harm to the late  
5 RGT and Plaintiff VT.

6 34. That the late RGT developed multiple open skin breakdowns and/or open areas all over  
7 his body, with an additional twelve (12) on different body parts. See Exhibit A (Body parts  
8 affected). The late RGT was admitted with an initial nine (9) total open areas but under the care  
9 of most of the Defendants, there were an additional twelve (12) more. Those tasked with the late  
10 RGT's care include: Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN,  
11 Defendant LYNN FLINT, STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS, Defendant HAROLD ORTIZ,  
12 Nursing, Defendant MARCO GOMEZ, NURSE.

13 35. That the aforementioned Defendants had a duty to the late RGT to ensure that he did not  
14 develop more open areas anywhere in his body. These Defendants breached their duty to their  
15 patient because under their care, their patient, the late RGT, developed more open areas, with a  
16 total of an additional twelve (12) open areas and skin breakdown all over his body.

17 36. That the late RGT suffered increased pain from all of these skin breakdowns and/or open  
18 areas. See Exhibit B (Photos of affected areas). Those tasked with the late RGT's care include:  
19 Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN, Defendant LYNN FLINT,  
20 STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS, Defendant HAROLD ORTIZ, Nursing, Defendant  
21 MARCO GOMEZ, NURSE. Firstly, it was documented on his medical chart that the late RGT  
22 experienced severe pain because of the skin breakdowns and/or open areas. See Exhibit C  
23 (Document of severe pain). Secondly, it is reasonable to assume there will actually be increased  
24 pain when there were more open areas.

25 37. That the aforementioned Defendants had a duty to the late RGT to ensure that he does not  
26 have more sources of additional excruciating pain anywhere in his body. These Defendants

27  
28 COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 6

1 breached their duty to their patient because under their care, their patient, the late RGT,  
2 developed more sources of pain because he developed more skin breakdowns.

3 38. That the late RGT was a Full Code as of July 8, 2021. See Exhibit D (Letter to health  
4 team by Russell Gene Thompson). Also See Exhibit E (Discharge Summary with Full Code).

5 39. That Defendant STETSON and/or STETSON'S AGENT turned off RGT's heart  
6 defibrillator on October 5, 2021. Defendant STETSON admitted in his documentation that he  
7 wanted the defibrillator off, that the other unidentified Defendant, named DOES 1 through 100,  
8 also wanted the defibrillator off, and Defendant STETSON told the wife that it was his duty to  
9 turn it off because the late RGT was a Do Not Resuscitate/Do Not Intubate, and that Defendant  
10 STETSON and his medical team thought it was their ethical duty to turn off the defibrillator. See  
11 Exhibit F (Stetson note with his decision to turn off defibrillator). See Exhibit G (Another  
12 documentation of unilaterally ending the late RGT's life). As far as the late RGT and Plaintiff  
13 VT were concerned, the late RGT was a Full Code, and they did not want to have the  
14 defibrillator turned off while he was still alive.

15 40. That Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN and Defendant  
16 LYNN FLINT, STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS failed to disclose to RGT and/or VT the  
17 material risk of death; the material risk actually happened, and was the proximate cause of the  
18 injury to RGT; and any ordinary reasonable person in the position of RGT and/or VT would have  
19 decided against turning off the heart defibrillator AICD, at that time, if known of the risk of  
20 death thereafter which could be sooner than both anticipated.

21 41. That Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN and Defendant  
22 LYNN FLINT, STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS, and the rest of the healthcare team had a  
23 duty to practice informed consent regarding turning off RGT's defibrillator.

24 42. That the aforementioned Defendant/s breached that duty because informed consent about  
25 turning off the defibrillator was not done.

26 43. That the late RGT died at 6:06 am on October 6, 2021.

27  
28 COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 7

1       44. That Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN, Defendant LYNN  
2 FLINT, STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS, and the rest of the healthcare team, are all liable  
3 for murder because the death of the late RGT was a result of killing with malice aforethought,  
4

5       45. That in the late RGT's case, it is evident that there was malice aforethought because this  
6 was a killing done deliberately and intentionally because there was an intent on the  
7 aforementioned Defendants to end the late RGT's life. See Exhibit F (Stetson note with his  
8 decision to turn off defibrillator). Also See Exhibit G.

9       46. That Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN, Defendant LYNN  
10 FLINT, STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS, and the rest of the healthcare team, all had a duty  
11 to not turn off the defibrillator without giving the late RGT and Plaintiff VT full disclosure and  
12 getting a valid consent. The aforementioned Defendants breached that duty because the late  
13 RGT's defibrillator was turned off the defibrillator without the full disclosure and valid consent.  
14

15       47. That Plaintiff VT and her son Kenneth James, an Air Force employee, visited the VA  
16 Office of Decedent the next day(s) after the late RGT's death, and both of them talked to  
17 Defendant JUDITH WOLF.

18       48. That Plaintiff VT was told that she needed to sign a waiver to get an autopsy and to get  
19 the decedent RGT's body. WOLF told VT That if VT did not sign the waiver, then outside  
20 services would charge VT around \$37,000. VT did not have \$37,000 so she signed a waiver.  
21 Exhibit H (Authorization for Autopsy and Responsibility for Burial, here forth called "Waiver").  
22

23       49. That Plaintiff VT was trying to get the decedent RGT's body after a few days, but  
24 Defendant Wolf was refusing to release the corpse. Plaintiff VT did not fully understand that  
25 signing the Waiver meant that she was entirely giving up the corpse of her husband. She thought  
26 that she just did not have to pay the \$37,000.  
27

28       50. That Defendant WOLF had a duty to fully inform a still grieving, just-widowed spouse  
29 that by signing a waiver, this encompasses the autopsy costs and the holding of the corpse.  
30

31 COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
32 AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
33 SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 8  
34

1 Defendant WOLF breached this duty because she did not fully inform Plaintiff VT of all material  
2 facts pertinent to signing the Waiver.

3 51. That the amount of this claim is computed whereby the CA cap on each medical  
4 malpractice claim for general non-economic damages of \$250,000 is venerated, but the total  
5 amount computed exceeds this because of the total number of causes of actions which are hereby  
6 mentioned.

7 52. That the acts of medical malpractice on the Defendants who were directly involved in the  
8 late RGT's care leading to the physical pain and eventual death of the late RGT occurred during  
9 RGT's stay as a patient in Defendant VA-SF.

10  
11                   **V. CAUSES OF ACTION**

12                   **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13                   **LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT**

14 53. Defendant STETSON ("MD"), committed the tort of lack of informed consent on RGT  
15 and/or VT because he failed to disclose to RGT and/or VT the material risks and dangers  
16 inherently involved in turning off the heart defibrillator AICD which was death sooner or later  
17 after turning it off; the undisclosed material risk and danger actually materialized and were the  
18 proximate cause of the injury to RGT; and any ordinary reasonable person in the position of  
19 RGT and/or VT would have decided against turning off the heart defibrillator AICD, at that time,  
20 if known of the risk of death thereafter.

21 54. As previously mentioned, the MD turned off the AICD of RGT.

22 55. Firstly, there was a known material risk to turning off an AICD which is that the patient  
23 will more likely than not die because the AICD is the instrumentality which monitors the heart of  
24 the patient and the AICD shocks the heart if it needs to be. A person dying is an obvious  
25 material risk.

26  
27  
28 COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 9

1       56. Secondly, MD did not disclose to spouse VT in their phone conversation that if MD turns  
2 off the AICD that afternoon, that it is more likely than not that if there was an abnormality in  
3 RGT's heart rhythm, that the AICD will not be there anymore to make the heart continue beating  
4 normally like before, which sustained RGT's life, and that will lead to RGT's ultimate clinical  
5 death (defined as cessation of cardiac function). RGT's possible death, which was either  
6 inherent or even potential, was not disclosed.

7       57. Thirdly, spouse VT or any ordinary reasonable prudent person would have wanted to  
8 know this material risk and would have said no to stopping the AICD that afternoon, if told of  
9 the material risk. VT, amongst all people, would have wanted to be at her spouse's side if she  
10 knew that turning the AICD off would possibly make RGT's death faster because there was no  
11 more monitoring of RGT's heart function. VT had always been adamantly fighting to sustain  
12 RGT's life. Even RGT himself wrote in his June letter to resuscitate him and further his life.  
13 (See Exhibit D – RGT's July 8, 2021 letter.) Also, any ordinary normal person would have  
14 wanted to know of the material risk of hurrying up the death of his or her relative if an AICD  
15 was stopped.

16       58. Fourthly, the material risk happened, being the death of RGT. A few hours after MD  
17 stopped the AICD, RGT died. However, MD could argue that it was all coincidental because  
18 RGT was suffering from multiple diagnoses. The coroner's report stated that cause of death was  
19 hypoxia secondary to frequent aspirations. Hypoxia is decreased oxygen in the blood. Frequent  
20 aspirations are repeatedly choking on his own saliva. If this was the cause of death, then having  
21 an AICD to monitor the heart to keep on pumping oxygen would have at least, more likely than  
22 not, extended RGT's life more. It is important to note that RGT had frequent aspirations for  
23 some time prior to his death and did not die from these then. Here, after pulling out the AICD,  
24 he died several hours, more likely than not, because of the pulling out of the AICD.

25       59. Thus, Defendant MD committed the tort of lack of informed consent on RGT and/or his  
26 surviving spouse and personal representative VT.

27  
28       COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 10

## **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

# **NEGLIGENCE ASSOCIATED WITH THE TORT OF LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT**

60. RGT and/or responsible party VT were not informed of a material fact when turning off the defibrillator that afternoon, specifically that turning off would more likely than not hasten the death of RGT.

61. Firstly, STETSON and/or STETSON'S agent had a duty to practice informed consent regarding turning off RGT's defibrillator.

62. Secondly, STETSON and/or STETSON'S agent breached that duty because he did not practice informed consent when he turned off RGT's defibrillator.

63. Thirdly, STETSON and/or STETSON'S agent's negligent conduct was the actual cause of hastening RGT's death because RGT and/or spouse VT would have thought about the material risk involved by turning off the defibrillator. But for the STETSON and/or STETSON'S agent's negligent conduct, RGT and/or VT would have thought about the material risks involved in turning off the defibrillator.

64. Fourthly, the STETSON and/or STETSON'S agent's negligent conduct was the proximate cause of the RGT and/or VT not thoroughly understanding the immediate consequences of turning off the defibrillator. It was foreseeable that if a patient RGT and/or spouse VT were not informed that turning off the defibrillator would bring about a quicker death, then RGT would not have died a few hours after it was turned off.

65. Fifthly, damage to RGT was that he died a few hours after turning the defibrillator off.

52. Thus, STETSON and/or STETSON'S agent is/are liable for negligence associated with not practicing informed consent which hastened RGT's death.

## **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

CIVIL HOMICIDE

**COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 11**

1       66. Defendant MD is liable for murder because the death of RGT was a result of killing with  
2 malice aforethought, either with express malice or implied malice.

3       67. Here, RGT was in the care of VA-SF, specifically under MD.

4       68. Firstly, there was an unlawful killing because RGT was killed while he was a patient,  
5 without consent by RGT himself nor his wife VT. It was under RGT's specific direction that all  
6 measures should be done to extend his life, except to use of cardiac compressions because of the  
7 existence of his defibrillator AICD. RGT did not want to tamper with its proper functioning.

8       69. Secondly, it was evident that there was malice aforethought, which could be express or  
9 implied.

10      70. This could be "express" malice because when MD turned off the defibrillator AICD, he  
11 knew that turning this off would hasten RGT's death. RGT had been on defibrillator for years  
12 and had depended on this to keep his heart functioning properly to sustain his life.

13      71. This could also be "implied" malice because the homicide showed an abandoned and  
14 malignant heart. Per the court, an abandoned and malignant heart killing results from an  
15 intentional act - the turning off of the defibrillator, and this intentional act's consequences are  
16 dangerous to life itself - the death of the patient. Either express or implied malice, the MD had  
17 the malice aforethought requirement for murder.

18      72. Thus, MD is liable for murder because the death of RGT was a result of killing with  
19 malice aforethought, either with express malice or implied malice.

21                          FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

22                          **NEGLIGENCE ASSOCIATED WITH CIVIL HOMICIDE**

23      73. Firstly, there was a duty by STETSON and/or STETSON's agent to not turn off the  
24 defibrillator because turning off a defibrillator would result in hastening a patient's death, here  
25 done recklessly or negligently.

26  
27  
28                          COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 12

1       74. Secondly, STETSON and/or STETSON'S agent breached that duty because he turned off  
2 the defibrillator, done recklessly or negligently.

3       75. Thirdly, STETSON and/or STETSON'S agent's negligent conduct was the actual cause  
4 of hastening RGT's death. But for STETSON's negligence, then RGT would have still lived  
5 longer.

6       76. Fourthly, the STETSON and/or STETSON'S agent's negligent conduct was the  
7 proximate cause of hastening RGT's death. It was foreseeable that if a defibrillator is turned off,  
8 the patient's death is accelerated.

9       77. Fifthly, damage to RGT was that he died a few hours after turning the defibrillator off.

10      78. Thus, STETSON and/or STETSON'S agent is/are liable for negligence associated with  
11 unlawful homicide.

12

#### 13                   FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### 14                   **FRAUD OR DECEIT**

15      79. Defendant VA-SF employee Judith Wolf ("WOLF") committed fraud or deceit because  
16 she misrepresented a material fact, knowing that this material fact is false, intended to induce  
17 reliance by VT on this fact, VT justifiably relied on this misrepresentation, and resulted to  
18 damages.

19      80. Upon the demise of RGT, VT and her son Kenneth James, an Air Force employee, visited  
20 the VA Office of Decedent and both of them talked to WOLF.

21      81. Firstly, VT was told that she needed to sign a waiver to get an autopsy and to get the  
22 decedent RGT's body. WOLF told VT That if VT did not sign the waiver, then outside services  
23 would charge VT around \$37,000. VT did not have \$37,000 so she signed a waiver. This was a  
24 misrepresentation because this was an assertion not in accord with the facts as WOLF adamantly  
25 refused to give RGT's body back to VT claiming that VT already "signed a waiver."

26      82. Secondly, WOLF had knowledge of what she actually told VT.

27

28      COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 13

83. Thirdly, what WOLF told VT induced reliance in VT that she did not have to pay the \$37,000 for the autopsy but still would be able to keep her spouse's dead body.

84. Fourthly, VT justifiably relied on WOLF's assertion because there was no reason for VT to believe that WOLF would tell her otherwise. WOLF is an employee of the VA office, and should be knowledgeable enough, and compassionate enough to deal with a still grieving close relative of a recently deceased veteran. Also, VT would not have given up her recently deceased spouse's body because all these times VT was fighting for his life.

85. Fifthly, damage to VT resulted because she was so distraught and distressed not just of the death of RGT, but also because of not seeing his body for proper funeral and burial services.

86. Thus, VA-SF employee Judith Wolf committed fraud or deceit.

## SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**NEGLIGENCE ASSOCIATED WITH NON-DISCLOSURE TO SPOUSE VT OF  
SIGNING WAIVER REGARDING CORPSE OF RGT**

87. Non-disclosure of all information and consequences of signing a waiver regarding RGT's corpse is also pursued under negligence by WOLF.

88. Firstly, there was a duty by WOLF to inform spouse VT about the waiver and all the consequences which a waiver entailed.

89. Secondly, WOLF breached that duty because she did not inform VT about facts and consequences of a waiver.

90. Thirdly, WOLF's negligent conduct was the actual cause of VT's mistake about the waiver and the consequences of signing a waiver. But for WOLF's negligence, then spouse VT would not have signed a waiver.

91. Fourthly, the WOLF's negligent conduct was the proximate cause of VT's mistake about the waiver and the consequences of signing a waiver. It was foreseeable that if WOLF did not fully disclose the act of a waiver and its consequences, then VT would sign the waiver.

**COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 14**

92. Fifthly, damages done was to RGT with his corpse not being released right away to his spouse VT, and damages to VT was that she was not able to see her dead spouse's body within a reasonable amount of time.

93. Thus, WOLF is/are liable for negligence associated with non-disclosure of the act and consequences of signing a waiver.

## **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**DETENTION OF CORPSE OR HUMAN REMAINS IN VIOLATION OF CA Health & Safety Code § 7053**

94. Defendant WOLF committed detention of corpse or human remains, in violation of CA Health & Safety Code § 7053 which states as follows:

Every person who arrests, attaches, detains, or claims to detain any human remains for any debt or demand, or upon any pretended lien or charge, or fails to release any human remains, the personal effects, or any certificate or permit required under Division 102 (commencing with Section 102100) that is in his or her possession or control forthwith upon the delivery of authorization for the release signed by the next of kin or by any person entitled to the custody of the remains, is guilty of a misdemeanor. (CA Health & Safety Code § 7053 (2020)

95. A few days after the autopsy was completed, VT tried to reclaim RGT's body, but Wolf said that she cannot have the body because she signed the waiver that waived her right to claim the body. RGT's body was detained by Wolf. RGT's body was in Wolf's possession and control.

96. Defendant WOLF asserted that since VT signed the waiver, VT intentionally relinquished her right to the dead body. VT did not have full knowledge of this because she signed the waiver with the knowledge that she will be relieved to pay off the \$37,000 which was being asked of her.

**COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 15**

but not of intentionally relinquishing her right to get her dead spouse's body back after the autopsy. In VT's situation, this period of time that she was deprived of the body was deplorable and disturbing because she thought that she could no longer have proper funeral and burial services for RGT.

97. Plaintiff VT was only able to have the late RGT's body after more than two (2) weeks from the signing of the waiver(?).

98. Thus, VA-SF employee Wolf committed detention of corpse or human remains, in violation of CA Health & Safety Code § 7053.

## EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## **NEGLIGENCE BECAUSE OF MORE OPEN AREAS ALL OVER THE PLAINTIFF'S BODY**

99. RGT was in VA-SF from August 19, 2021 to October 6, 2021. This was seven (7) weeks under the VA-SF care.

100. Upon admission, RGT had nine (9) open areas all over his body. (Exhibit A.) During this admission, RGT developed an additional twelve (12) areas, including skin breakdown on his penis. (Exhibit A.)

101. Firstly, the staff directly involved in his care, including Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN, for the late RGT, Defendant LYNN FLINT, STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS, for the late RGT, and Defendant MARCO GOMEZ, NURSE, for the late RGT, (collectively "the staff") have a duty to prevent more ulcers in RGT's body. It was known upon admission that RGT was already at risk of having decubitus, thus, the staff was on notice of this condition.

102. Secondly, the staff breached its duty to RGT because more open areas developed. Maybe one or two more would be explainable, but an additional twelve (12) open areas overall were way too many.

COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 16

103. Thirdly, the staff's negligent conduct was the actual cause of the development of RGT's additional ulcers. But for the staff's negligent conduct, the additional ulcers would not have developed.

104. Fourthly, the staff's negligent conduct was the proximate cause of the additional ulcers. It was foreseeable that if the staff neglects to adequately care for RGT's increased risk of developing the open areas, then more ulcers will develop.

105. Fifthly, damage to RGT was that he had more open areas.

106. Thus, the staff is liable for negligence which brought about more open areas on RGT.

## NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**NEGLIGENCE BECAUSE OF MORE PAIN ON PLAINTIFF, CAUSED BY THE  
ADDITIONAL OPEN AREAS ALL OVER THE PLAINTIFF'S BODY**

107. In RGT's situation, pain management from the additional open areas was not effective. It was documented in the medical chart that RGT "appears to be in a lot of pain from open areas. Winces with most movement and manipulation." (EXHIBIT C, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence).

108. Firstly, the staff directly involved in his care including Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN, for the late RGT, Defendant LYNN FLINT, STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS, for the late RGT, and Defendant MARCO GOMEZ, NURSE, for the late RGT, (collectively “the staff”), had a duty to ensure that RGT received adequate pain management. RGT’s ulcers multiplied, thus, more pain management routine should have been given.

109. Secondly, the staff breached its duty to RGT because even though the ulcers were present, and even became more, it was documented that he still was in a lot of pain. It was even documented that RGT was even deprived of any pain meds. It was in the same medical chart (See Exhibit C, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence) that “. . . Has not gotten any doses the last few days with increasing tachypnea, diaphoresis, and general uncomfortable appearing nature.”

COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 17

110. Thirdly, the staff's negligent conduct was the actual cause of RGT's pain. But for the staff's negligent conduct, then RGT's pain would have been lessened, if not extinguished.

111. Fourthly, the staff's negligent conduct was the proximate cause of RGT's pain. It was foreseeable that if the staff neglects to give adequate and sufficient pain control for RGT, then RGT would be in more severe pain than what he started with. It is important to note that he came in with way fewer open areas than what he developed in VA-SF.

112. Fifthly, damages or harm to RGT was that he was in more pain. The chart mentioning that RGT was wincing with most movement and manipulation was evidence that he was in pain.

113. Thus, the staff is liable for negligence which brought about more severe and excruciating pain on RGT.

## **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**NEGLIGENCE BECAUSE OF NOT PROVIDING RANGE OF MOTION TO THE LATE RGT WHICH CONTRIBUTES TO STIFFNESS AND DISCOMFORT**

114. RGT was in VA-SF from August 19, 2021 to October 6, 2021. Again, this was seven (7) weeks under the VA-SF care.

115. In all the documentation obtained by the Plaintiff VT, there was no mention that any of the Defendants provided range of motion exercises to the joints of the late RGT.

116. Firstly, the staff directly involved in his care, including Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN, for the late RGT, Defendant LYNN FLINT, STAFF PHYSICIAN, GERIATRICS, for the late RGT, and Defendant MARCO GOMEZ, NURSE, for the late RGT, (collectively “the staff”) had a duty to ensure or order another staff, that range of motion, often called “ROM exercises” were provided to patients who are unable to move their bodies actively. Not providing ROM exercises lead to stiffness and discomfort.

117. Secondly, the staff breached its duty to RGT because there were no ROM exercises provided.

**COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 18**

118. Thirdly, the staff's negligent conduct was the actual cause of more pain and discomfort  
2 because the joints are stiff. But for the staff's negligent conduct, the joints of the late RGT  
3 would have been more mobile, decreasing stiffness and discomfort.

119. Fourthly, the staff's negligent conduct was the proximate cause of the additional stiffness  
5 and discomfort. It was foreseeable that if the staff neglects to provide ROM exercises, then this  
6 was a source of stiffness and discomfort.

120. Fifthly, damage to RGT was that he had more stiffness and discomfort, and would  
8 definitely be wincing upon movement.

121. Thus, the staff is liable for negligence because no ROM exercises were provided to the  
10 late RGT, increasing stiffness and discomfort.

12 TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

13 **NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF BECAUSE VA-SF BREACHED ITS DUTY TOWARDS THE**  
14 **LATE RGT, WHICH CAUSED RGT TO HAVE MORE OPEN AREAS ON RGT'S**  
15 **BODY**

16 VA-SF is liable for negligence because VA-SF owes its patients the duty of protection,  
17 and VA-SF did not exercise reasonable care towards RGT, which brought about more open  
18 areas, in addition to the continued existence of the initial ones.

19 RGT was in VA-SF from August 19, 2021 to October 6, 2021. This was seven (7) weeks  
20 under the VA-SF care. Upon admission, RGT had stage 4 sacral decubitus ulcer and bilateral  
21 heel ulcers. After being admitted to VA-SF, RGT developed a total of 12 open areas everywhere  
22 on his body, including skin breakdown on his penis.

23 Firstly, VA-SF had a duty to ensure that RGT did not have more open areas than what he  
24 started out with. Duty of care extends to all foreseeable plaintiffs, within the scope of risk of  
25 defendant's negligent conduct. The standard of care for a hospital is reasonable care, with duty  
26 of protection.

27  
28 COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 19

125. Secondly, VA-SF breached its duty because RGT eventually ended up with additional 12 open areas on his body.

126. Thirdly, VA-SF's negligent conduct is the actual cause of the continued existence of the original nine (9) open areas, and the additional twelve (12) open areas. But for the negligence of VA-SF, the continued existence of the open areas and/or the addition of more ulcers would have been limited, if not curtailed. If VA-SF had steps in place to ensure that if a patient was admitted with open areas, then special monitoring of such shall be exercised. It should have been able to prevent more open areas through education of its staff. It should have been able to eliminate, decrease the size, or at least keep the status quo of the open areas. If there was no special monitoring procedure or special processes addressing open areas, then this was the omission. But for the existence of this monitoring, RGT's open areas would have been addressed sufficiently.

127. Fourthly, VA-SF's conduct is the proximate cause of the continued existence of, and addition of more open areas. It was foreseeable that if VA-SF was not negligent, be it in conduct or in its omission, then this would not have happened.

128. Fifthly, damages or harm to RGT was his continued suffering, with existing initial open areas, and more suffering with the addition of more open areas.

129. Thus, the VA-SF is liable for negligence because of RGT's open areas, continued existence of the nine (9) initial ones on admission, and the addition of twelve (12) more during this period of admission.

## THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF BECAUSE VA-SF BREACHED ITS DUTY TOWARDS THE LATE RGT, WHICH BROUGHT ABOUT ADDITIONAL SEVERE AND EXCRUCIATING PAIN DIRECTLY AS A RESULT OF RGT'S OPEN AREAS**

**COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 20**

1       130. In RGT's situation, pain management from the additional open areas was not effective. It  
2 was documented that RGT "appears to be in a lot of pain from open areas. Winces with most  
3 movement and manipulation." (EXHIBIT A) (Page 176 of 3034).

4       131. Firstly, VA-SF has a duty as a hospital to all its patients. As mentioned, this is duty of  
5 protection/reasonable care. Duty to protect RGT from more injury than what he started out with,  
6 with concomitant duty to protect RGT from more pain than what he started out with.

7       132. Secondly, VA-SF breached its duty to RGT because RGT developed more open areas  
8 with its concomitant increased pain. Any skin lesion generally involves pain. More skin lesions  
9 then logically entail more pain. Here, RGT was admitted with pain meds, but this should have  
10 been reviewed more often, modified if it could have modified, communicated with the entire  
11 health team on how to decrease if not eliminate RGT's pain. "The measure of duty of a hospital  
12 is to exercise that degree of care, skill and diligence used by hospitals generally in that  
13 community, and required by the express or implied contract of the undertaking." *Rice v.*  
14 *California Lutheran Hospital*, (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 296, 299. Having employees does not take  
15 liability out from the hospital's duty and breach thereof.

16       133. Thirdly, VA-SF's negligent conduct is the actual cause of RGT's more pain because RGT  
17 was still in pain until the end of his life. But for VA-SF's conduct, in its act or omission, RGT  
18 would have been less in pain, if not in no pain. If VA-SF had steps in place to ensure that if a  
19 patient was admitted with pain and then more sources of pain developed (open areas), then  
20 special monitoring of such shall be exercised. It should have been able to prevent more pain and  
21 sources of more pain through education of its staff. It should have been able to eliminate the  
22 pain, decrease the pain, or at least keep the status quo of the pain and prevent to add more  
23 sources of pain. If there was no special monitoring procedure or special processes addressing  
24 pain and how to prevent adding more pain to a patient, then this was the omission. But for the  
25 existence of this monitoring, RGT's pain and sources of more pain would have been addressed  
26 sufficiently.

27  
28 COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 21

1       134. Fourthly, VA-SF's negligence is the proximate cause of RGT's continued pain because it  
2       is foreseeable that if VA-SF breached its duty to protect RGT, specifically duty to address pain  
3       and prevent from adding more pain, then RGT would be in agony.

4       135. Fifthly, damage or injury to RGT was him having more pain than what he started out  
5       with. Damage to VT was seeing all these and suffered from extreme distraught/distress while  
6       RGT was in VA-SF's care.

7       136. Thus, the VA-SF is liable for negligence because of RGT's additional more severe and  
8       excruciating pain directly a result of his open areas.  
9

#### 10                  FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### 11                  **VA-SF VICARIOUSLY LIABLE**

12       137. VA-SF is vicariously liable as an employer for all the aforementioned causes of actions.

13       138. It is well-established that in *respondeat superior*, an employer is vicariously liable for the  
14       torts of its employees committed within the scope of the employment.

15       139. Here, VA-SF is the employer of the employees named in all of the aforementioned causes  
16       of actions. The employees committed the improper wrongful conduct while they were in the  
17       hospital premises, during employment, and within the scope of employment. An employer is  
18       vicariously liable for the torts of its employees.

19                  Thus, VA-SF is vicariously liable as an employer for all the aforementioned causes of  
20       actions.

#### 22                  FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### 23                  **VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE LAW (EADACPA) FOR ALL VA-SF 24       DEFENDANTS STAFF AND VA-SF ITSELF AS AN INSTITUTION**

25       140. VA-SF staff, including Defendant GEOFFREY STETSON, ATTENDING  
26       PHYSICIAN, for The late RGT, Defendant LYNN FLINT, STAFF PHYSICIAN,

27  
28       COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 22

1 GERIATRICS, for The late RGT, and Defendant MARCO GOMEZ, NURSE, for the late RGT,  
2 (collectively “the staff”), and the VA-SF itself as an entity are both liable for violation of the  
3 Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act (EADACPA), commonly called the CA  
4 Elder Abuse Law (Welfare & Inst. Code ‘ 15600, et seq.), because of the neglect of an elderly  
5 person and/or the deprivation by both of services that are necessary to avoid physical harm or  
6 mental suffering.

7 141. Additionally, CACI 3103 specifically provides for a cause of action against a health care  
8 provider for custodial neglect without regard to the type of facility, which includes a general  
9 acute care hospital such as Defendant VA-SF. See Exhibit I (CACI 3103).

10 142. Firstly, in RGT’s situation, there was negligence on the part of VA-SF staff, VA-SF  
11 itself, and vicarious liability of VA-SF. These were discussed above individually.

12 143. Secondly, there was deprivation by the VA-SF staff and VA-SF itself of goods or  
13 services that are necessary to avoid physical harm or mental suffering. In the cause of actions  
14 against the aforementioned, RGT and spouse VT are both asserting that the aforementioned  
15 should have done something to alleviate RGT’s plight. However, instead of alleviating RGT’s  
16 plight, their wrongful conduct or negligent conduct were even the actual and/or proximate cause  
17 of his downfall and eventual death. For RGT, this included: no informed consent from patient  
18 RGT and/or spouse VT to turn defibrillator off; negligent care of the VA-SF staff which made  
19 RGT’s open areas multiply; negligent care of the VA-SF staff which made RGT’s pain continue  
20 and even made worse. For spouse VT, this included: no informed consent from spouse VT to  
21 turn off respirator; intentionally misrepresented the waiver; detaining the corpse of the late RGT  
22 for a period of time.

23 144. Furthermore, aside from the wrongful or improper or negligent conduct, omissions from  
24 the defendants were numerous. For all of the causes of action, processes to ensure that patients  
25 like RGT would not just have their defibrillators turned off without obtaining proper consent  
26 from the wife to ensure that the spouses can say their goodbyes in their own terms, telling the

27  
28 COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 23

surviving spouse that she cannot have the dead spouse's body after autopsy, having multiple open areas in the body on an already debilitated thin frail elderly, and increasing the pain because RGT developed more sores during this hospital stay, should have been in place. The defendants just did not do enough to maintain and keep what RGT had before going to VA-SF. If maintained, at best, then RGT would not have suffered more sores, had more pain from these, and possibly still alive. Prior to being admitted to VA-SF, he did not have these.

145. Thus, the VA-SF staff and the VA-SF itself as an institution are both liable for violation of the CA Elder Abuse Law (EADACPA) because of the neglect of an elderly person and/or the deprivation by both of services that are necessary to avoid physical harm or mental suffering.

## SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## **WRONGFUL DEATH**

146. Surviving spouse Plaintiff VT is asserting a claim for wrongful death because there was a  
tort, resulting to death, and damages to VT were incurred.

147. Here, Plaintiff VT will be able to establish (a) informed consent failure; (b) civil murder; (c) negligence by VA-SF itself as an entity; (d) vicarious liability of VA-SF; and (e) elder abuse. Additionally, there was a resulting death secondary to these causes of actions. Also, damages were incurred as a result of these which include economic and non-economic compensatory damages including pain and suffering, disfigurement, emotional distress, anxiety, and mental anguish.

148. Only Plaintiff VT amongst the heirs is asserting this cause of action. Nominal Defendant Michelle R. Thompson-Cowgill, Nominal Defendant Katherine Thompson, and Nominal Defendant Dirk R. Thompson are not Plaintiffs in this suit.

COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 24

PRAAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against defendants and each of them as follows:

1. For nominal damages to vindicate the wrongs done to the late RGT and spouse VT.
  2. For an award of the late RGT's general compensatory damages in the sum of \$250,000 for each cause of action because he suffered non-economic damages which included: pain and suffering, emotional distress, anxiety, mental anguish, loss of consortium, inconvenience, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of opportunity, and disfigurement, totaling \$3,000,000 for all twelve counts of causes of action.
  3. For an award on Plaintiff VT's general compensatory damages in the sum of \$250,000 for each cause of action because she suffered non-economic damages which included: pain and suffering, emotional distress, anxiety, and mental anguish, and inconvenience totaling \$750,000 for all 3 counts of causes of action.
  4. For an award of Plaintiff VT's wrongful death cause of action in the sum of \$250,000 for each cause of action because she suffered non-economic damages which included: pain and suffering, emotional distress, anxiety, mental anguish, loss of consortium, inconvenience, loss of enjoyment of life, and loss of opportunity for each cause of action, totaling \$250,000 for 1 count of cause of action.
  5. For punitive damages because of the multiplicity of the causes of action showing willful, wanton, and malicious conduct of the Defendant/s against an elderly couple, up to nine times of the total final award, whichever amount this honorable Court deems fit;
  6. For interest accrued to date;
  7. For cost of suit and expenses incurred;
  8. For all such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 25

1  
2 DATED: August 17, 2022  
3

*Richard Taguinod*

4  
5 Richard Aguila Taguinod  
6 Attorney for Plaintiff Russell Gene  
7 Thompson, and Victoria Thompson  
8

*Eloisa Songco Quiambao*

9 Eloisa Songco Quiambao  
10 Attorney for Plaintiff Russell Gene  
11 Thompson, and Victoria Thompson  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF INFORMED CONSENT, CIVIL HOMICIDE, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING OPEN  
AREAS, NEGLIGENCE CAUSING MORE PAIN, NEGLIGENCE OF VA-SF, VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF VA-  
SF, VIOLATION OF THE CA ELDER ABUSE ACT, SURVIVAL ACTION, AND WRONGFUL DEATH - 26